

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

## Minutes for the September 12, 2011 Meeting

**Chairman: Oliver Smith; Vice Chairman: Ann Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison**

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent/Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance With N=Nay  
P=Present R=Recuse SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 3 October 2011

Approved: 17 October 2011

**1.**

**Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:**

**07:05 PM**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H		Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W N O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
P	P	P	P	P		P	A	P	P	P	A	P	P	P

**Notes:** Vick & Jackson excused; seat six vacant

**Quorum Established: 12 present**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**2.**

**Approval of Minutes: July 11, 2011**

**Motion:** Approve Minutes of July 11, 2011, as corrected

**Maker/Second:** Quinley/Hofler

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 11-1-0** Voice Glavinic dissents

**3.**

**Open Forum:**

Lynn Miller [resident of VC] – Invitation to members of VCCPG to attend a conference on sustainable development. The invitation is to be extended to all planning groups. This is a non-partisan event. Several speakers with differing views will make presentations. The conference is November 12<sup>th</sup> in Mira Mesa see folder.

Michael Karp [VC resident] – Offers VCCPG and public fruit from his orchard.

Deb Hofler – Re Solar Orchard presentation September 21<sup>st</sup> at VC Library, 6.00 pm for neighbors of the project. She expects the same presentation to be made to the VCCPG in October. The meeting is open to the public. The 8 Mega Watt solar electric installation is located on 50 acres between Vesper Rd and Valley Center Rd about ¾ mile east of Cole Grade. The applicants have formally requested a major use permit from the County.

Britsch inquires about J-36 Community Right of Way standards review by BOS. [Approved]

**4.**

**Announcements & Items of Public Interest for Discussion:**

**4.a.**

**Summary of Residential Design Guidelines Stakeholders Workshop held 8/26 (Smith)**

Smith reports that the County is trying to put together guidelines to help developers get through the planning process. The County wants developers to consult local planning groups.

**4.b.**

**Appointment of Dave Anderson to represent the VCCPG on a County committee to initiate a Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE) Pilot Program (Smith)**

Smith presents the need to appoint a representative to committee for the subject project. Anderson accepts appointment.

**4.c.**

**Report and discussion of Community Evacuation Routes Study Group and consultants report about proposed evacuation routes and standards (Smith/Hutchison)**

Smith reports on CERS paper No. 4 that has been submitted to Mobility SC and VCCPG. A key element is that escape routes must be public roads for reasons of liability and maintenance. Gated routes are not acceptable to County. A good example of this is Canal Rd. on the San Pasqual Reservation. The downside is the high cost to construct new roads that meet County standards. Stimulus funds could work but projects must be shovel-ready. This study will move this project toward being shovel-ready for other grants. Rudolf asks that Bob Citrano explore alternatives for emergency evacuation using private roads the liability removed from the owners of the private roads. Glavinic says no segments are presently public

	roads. And, that there is presently no designated construction money or access to recommended corridors.
<b>5.</b>	<b>Action Items:</b>
<b>5.a.</b>	<b>Discussion and possible vote on the concept master plan for the Konyn Dairy property following a Presentation from Bill Lewis. The Mobility, General Plan and South Village sub-committees and the VC Design Review Road have reviewed these plans. (Quinley for S. Village subcommittee)</b>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Bill Lewis introduces Trudy Konyn, who states: her family moved to Valley Center in 1971. They are proud of the dairy and the community, and are excited about the development project being presented by Mr. Lewis. She and her family will continue to live in VC. B. Lewis notes that the County says if they come up with a concept they can use it to raise money for their project. The concept would go to the county for the regular development review process. Lewis represents a few commercial projects in the south village. Matt Morrow assists B. Lewis, and is also design director. Lewis had the London Group evaluate the shopping traffic to Escondido and Fallbrook from VC. Only 35% of current traffic would use Grade after a market is built near the Konyn property. Lewis suggests VC is spending \$20 B to drive to Escondido for shopping. Glavinic asks about those who work in SD who would shop on way home. These are included in 35%. Lewis says in 2010 VC has 9,400 households. He says a north village market, a south village market and a market on the Bell property in south village would collectively remain under the 65% threshold of demand capture [a threshold of demand he regards as a limit of what local markets could expect to capture] . He suggests that this is more demand than 3 markets require for good business. He lists positive and negative attributes gathered from several groups. He suggests that the south village will have many of the desirable features named. He discusses VC design guidelines and how he will address them. He discusses his own design guidelines and emphasizes the need for good landscaping. He addresses the General Plan mixed-use area that includes the Konyn property and the flood plain area adjacent. The property is within 15 minutes walk of a wide area. He wants to include a lake in the flood plain area of the property. With residential development on the west side and north of creek. The County wants a trail along the creek. Bell's Least Vireo is present in some areas of the property. Rudolf asks about the north side of the lake trail. Lewis responds that the trail is a corridor for animals, not people. The 17-acre lake would have fingers of residential development projecting into it. North of the creek, there would be residential development with open spaces interspersed. Lewis anticipates a commercial plaza on south end of the property. He says roads are designed with VC design guidelines in mind. Traffic is an issue, presently with high speeds through the south village commercial areas. He suggests they are unsafe. He suggests roundabouts are effective at reducing speeds, more than traffic signals. Diameter of roundabouts would be 200' for four lanes. Large trucks can easily make such turns. However, he notes that the project doesn't depend on roundabouts. He addresses water issues such as 100-year floods and run-off [he proposes to use the lake to contain run-off] saying the project has 84-day storage ponds [3] on north side of creek. He emphasized birds among all wildlife and the importance of the lake to nesting birds. He addressed horses in VC and how the Konyn property could accommodate horses and the trades that serve equestrians.</p> <p>Comments: Glavinic desires commercial development in VC and approves of the location; but, he has concerns about the design. He wants to know what plans are made for mitigating noise from VC Road. B. Lewis responds: recommends berms either side of the road plus vegetation and building backs facing the road. 2<sup>nd</sup>, South village road [west side] must be functional for project to work for Glavinic. VCCPG must condition project on South Village Road development first. 3<sup>rd</sup>, he questions the economics of infrastructure on prices of commercial services; will space be \$2 or \$1 per square ft. Lewis responds that land is low cost; TIF fees [traffic impact fees] are \$5-6 per ft. and sewer is high-cost, but the proposed commercial developments will have a captive audience with no other nearby services. Bob Davis suggests that the project will generate about \$1M in TIF fees for the whole project. Lewis bases his estimate on the Bell project. Davis points out 37000 Average Daily Trips [ADT] on VC Road and if Mirar de Valle is not built how many ADTs will cause VC Road to fail. Asks if 40,000 ADTs on VC Road would cause it to fail. Response is that South Village Road will relieve VC Road. Davis questions whether road system in South Village will function without Mirar de Valle. What causes construction of the new roads before development? Lewis responds that South Village Road is a TIF road and would connect to Lilac. Davis questions how road construction will be financed and built before development. Not building new roads would put 40,000 ADTs</p>	

on VC Road. Dan Thornton: VC is a “through” area. He suggests the proposed roads would serve local traffic. Davis doesn’t relent on his question. He thinks roads must be built first. Rudolf, says VCCPG only needs to approve concept, not specifics at this time. Just the ideas. He suggests all projects, Bell, north and south villages will have to pay their fair share of road development costs in a phased approach. Davis won’t support plan with roundabouts. Lewis not wedded to roundabouts. Glavinic addresses horses. He doesn’t believe we should encourage horses in VC Road corridor. Rudolf responds that equestrians want northern access to Daley Ranch open space along VC Road.		
<b>Motion: Move we endorse the conceptual vision for the Konyn property as shown in graphic 13 without addressing the specific traffic calming measures to be included and without identifying any specific commercial uses.</b>		
<b>Maker/Second:</b> Quinley/Hofler		<b>Carries/Fails (Y-N-A):</b> 12-0-0 Voice
<b>5.b.</b>	<b>Discussion and vote on Circulation Subcommittee recommendations including those for a traffic signal at Cole Grade/Miller Road and a final recommendation on use of \$425,000 Valley Center road Safety improvements. (Davis)</b>	
<b>Discussion:</b> Davis discusses traffic light proposed at Cole Grade Rd. and Miller Rd. He recommends to VCCPG to add this traffic signal to the County list with the understanding that Cole Grade is being planned for improvement and any installation should be coordinated with that improvement design. Hofler questions whether this light should get priority. Rudolf asks about the difference between Capital Improvement Program [CIP] list and Traffic Advisory Committee [TAC] funds/list. Hofler says they are separate funds. Davis says we don’t know what other projects are higher priority. Rudolf suggests present motion would result in temporary signal that may be dismantled once Cole Grade Road is improved. Bachman asks how this item came to VCCPG. Davis responds from TAC recommendation. His hesitation is concerning why this item is getting attention.		
<b>Motion: Move VCCPG support adding the proposed installation of a traffic signal at Cole Grade Road and Miller Road to the TAC priority list provided it is coordinated with the proposed improvement design of Cole Grade Road and understanding that this traffic signal is not our highest priority and may not be necessary once Cole Grade Road is improved.</b>		
<b>Maker/Second:</b> Davis/Hofler		<b>Carries/Fails (Y-N-A):</b> 11-0-0 Voice
<b>Notes:</b> Anderson left before vote		
<b>5.c.</b>	<b>Discussion and possible vote on Request for BOS Reconsideration of GPU last-minute revision/approval of item concerning Leap Frog Development without public comments (See Attachment 1) (Rudolf)</b>	
<b>Discussion:</b> Rudolf suggests we let BOS know our displeasure with the leapfrog development provision added to the General Plan Update at the last minute without public discussion. Glavinic points out a few changes he would prefer in order to support the resolution. Several changes are made.		
<b>Motion:</b> Move we send BOS, Planning Commission, and Planning Department [DPLU] the resolution, as modified, as provided and cited below. [appended at end of minutes]		
<b>Maker/Second:</b> Rudolf/Hofler		<b>Carries/Fails (Y-N-A):</b> 10-1-0 Voice
<b>Notes:</b> Glavinic dissents		
<b>5.d.</b>	<b>Discussion and possible vote on DPLU’s revision of Department Policy that creates exceptions to the “One Bite of the Apple Policy” and represents a move away from DPLU’s policy that once something is decided, there is no further opportunity to change or amend it. (See Attachments 2 and 3) (Rudolf)</b>	
<b>Discussion:</b> Rudolf wants VCCPG to be aware of this issue. An example is the Orchard Run development and the conflicts it has with the VC community plan. The community was given only one chance to ask for changes. The policy of ‘one bite’ is an agency policy, not BOS policy. Smith agrees, but says we are not professional planners and don’t catch everything. But, developers shouldn’t have to back track at every overlooked issue. Glavinic suggests it is an iterative process.		
<b>Motion:</b> No motion		
<b>5.e.</b>	<b>Discussion and possible vote on meeting new county deadlines for VCCPG review of projects to ensure that the group has appropriate input into decisions. The VCCPG could elect to meet every two weeks or to distribute projects via e-mail or consider other strategies to ensure timely review. (Smith)</b>	
<b>Discussion:</b> Withdrawn		

5.f.	Discussion and vote to move the date of the next VCCPG regular meeting from October 10, 2011 to October 17, 2011 due to the county observed Columbus Day holiday. (Smith)	
Discussion: Smith asks VCCPG to move meeting in October to 17 <sup>th</sup> in consideration of Columbus Day		
Motion: Move VCCPG meet on October 17 in consideration of Columbus Day holiday		
Maker/Second: Smith/Bachman		Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 11-0-0 Voice
5.g.	Discussion and vote on Approval of Valley Center Parks & Recreation District's Proposed Five Year Projects Priority List for the Expenditure of Park Land Dedication Ordinance Funds. (Bachman)	
Discussion: Continued		
6.	Subcommittee Reports & Business:	
a)	Mobility – Robert Davis, Chair.	
b)	GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.	
c)	Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.	
d)	Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair.	
e)	Parks & Recreation – Brian Bachman, Chair.	
f)	Rancho Lilac – Ann Quinley, Chair. - inactive	
g)	Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair.	
h)	Spanish Trails/Segal Ranch – Mark Jackson, Chair. - inactive	
i)	Tribal Liason – Larry Glavinic, Chair	
j)	Website – Robert Davis, Chair Now has control of VCCPG.com and .org on one account. \$9.50 per month for account and \$15 for each domaine per year. Names on account to be Davis, Hutchison, Smith and Quinley	
k)	Pauma Ranch – Christine Lewis, Co-Chair; LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chair.	
l)	I-15/395 Master Planned Community [Accretive] – Steve Hutchison, Chair	
m)	Equine Ordinance - Smith, Chair	
7.	Correspondence Received for September 12, 2011 Agenda:	
a)	DPLU to VCCPG, Notice of Public Hearing held by the Historic Site Board of San Diego on July 18,2011 at 6:30 to consider recent changes to the Historic Building Code among other items. Hearing held at 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego.	
b)	DPLU to VCCPG, Stephens Wind Turbines Administrative Permit 3000 11-006 (AD); the project is an administrative permit to allow five 48-inch diameter, roof mounted wind turbines or fans pursuant to Section 6950 of the Zoning Ordinance. The project is located at 26904 Delridge Lane in Valley Center. Staff recommends that the Director of Planning and Land Use adopt the environmental findings and approve Administrative Permit AD 11-006 which includes findings necessary to ensure that the project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. (Bachman)	
c)	DPLU to VCCPG, Administrative Permit for Guest living quarters. At Richard Voth Property, 3000-110125 (AD11-024); project located at 30727 Lilac Hills Lane, Contact person: Marty Diaz, 308 Industrial Way, Fallbrook 92028 (Jackson)	
d)	DPLU to VCCPG, Butterfield Trails Ranch; TM 5551 P 08-028, (Second Iteration (2 XIS) Environmental Log No. 06-08-033. Project Address: Sunday Drive at Valley Center Road; APN 109-12-59-62 and 109-281-14 and 18. Project Issue Checklist detailing additional information or revisions that are required to make the document ready of public review or hearing is attached (Vick for South Village)	
e)	Department of Parks and Recreation to VCCPG-DPR is submitting an annual update for the VCCPG. It includes a 5-year park project priority list for the expenditure of Park Land Ordinance Dedication Ordinance funds in Valley Center and requesting VCCPG input into the creation of future priority lists. (Bachman)	
f)	San Diego County Traffic Advisory Committee to VCCPG; The Board of Supervisors continued a request to establish a stop control on Shiloh Lane and directed that the matter be continued to a future Traffic Advisory Committee meeting to determine the impact of proposed operation measures at this intersection. Staff will explore minor grading and further vegetation trimming to maximize intersectional visibility. (Davis)	
8.	Motion to Adjourn:	10.00pm
	Maker/Second: Quinley/Bachman	Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 11-0-0 Voice
Note: Next regular meeting scheduled for 17 October 2011		

VCCPG Resolution referred from item 5.c.

A RESOLUTION BY THE VCCPG TO REQUEST BOARD  
RECONSIDERATION AND REJECTION OF LAST-MINUTE  
ADDITION OF LEAPFROG DEVELOPMENT TO THE GENERAL

## PLAN UPDATE

Whereas the GPU came before the Board of Supervisors for potential Approval in the fall, 2010; and

Whereas the VCCPG has worked incredibly hard to ensure its content will best preserve, protect and enhance the future growth of the VC Community Planning Area as desired by its residents, businesses and property owners; and

Whereas Developers and Land Speculators Attorneys submitted a letter to the County Counsel, with copies to the Board Members, and NOT filed with the Clerk of the Board (so that it was totally secret from the public, and after closure of public input on the GPU); and

Whereas the Board included in its final approval of the GPU almost every single request for GPU changes the Attorneys' letter suggested, with no opportunity for the public to know of or comment upon or oppose those suggestions; and

Whereas the most serious of those was to allow Leapfrog Development where it had previously been generally prohibited, totally undermining the entire structure of the General Plan, and contrary to previous environmental analysis (and without any new analysis);

NOW, THEREFORE the Valley Center Community Planning Group expresses to the Board of Supervisors:

1. Its sense of betrayal by the Board of its previous commitment to a fair, open, transparent process and honoring of the many interests in the new General Plan, in addition to those of Developers and Land Speculators.
2. Its desire that the Board Reconsider and Reject its August 3, 2011 last-minute modification of the Draft GPU to include allowance for Leapfrog Development.

Adopted this 12<sup>th</sup> day of September 2011 at Valley Center California by a vote of 11-1-0

Steven Hutchison, Secretary  
Valley Center Community Planning Group